

supported by the specification.

Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, each of the rejected claims has been cancelled without prejudice to the filing of a divisional application thereto.

Claims 17, 19, 24, 25 and 75-78 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Singer et al.

The rejected claims are not deemed to be anticipated by the cited reference.

Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, each of the rejected claims has been cancelled without prejudice to the filing of a divisional application thereto.

Claims 36-58, 60, 64, 66, 73, 90, 108 and 111 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of USP 5,700,637.

The rejected claims are not deemed to be obviousness-type double patenting over the claims of USP '637.

Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, a Terminal Disclaimer is submitted herewith in accordance with PTO regulations.

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the Examiner's indication that claims 71 and 72 are allowed, and that claims 86, 95 and 105 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

No amendment to claim 86 is now deemed to be necessary, in view of the filing of the Terminal Disclaimer which overcomes the sole ground of rejection of claim 36 upon which claim 86 is dependent there upon.

Claims 95 and 105 have been rewritten as suggested by the Examiner in independent form.

Lastly, a minor clerical error has been corrected in the wording of claim 71.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin SOUTHERN

By: Warren M. Cheek, Jr.  
Warren M. Cheek, Jr.  
Registration No. 33,367  
Attorney for Applicant

WMC/dlk  
Washington, D.C.  
Telephone No. (202) 721-8200  
January 25, 1999